

Remarks

The specification has been amended to claim the benefit of a prior-filed application under 35 U.S.C. 119(e). This information concerning the priority benefit claim was recognized by the Office on the first filing receipt dated March 15, 2007. Therefore, Applicants have filed this amendment to the first sentence of the specification in compliance with 37 CFR 1.78 (a).

Claims 49-51 and 53-55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant's have amended Claims 49, 51, and 53 and cancelled Claim 50 in response to the Examiner's rejection. Applicants assert that the amended claims comply with the written description requirement of 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Basis for the amendments can be found in the specification and claims as filed. No new subject matter has been added.

Applicants believe this amendment places all pending Claims in condition for allowance. Since the present application is the earlier filed of the pending applications (numbers 11/571,933, 11/574,332, and 11/718,636), rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting, Applicants' assert that the Examiner should withdraw the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection and permit the present application to issue as a patent without a terminal disclaimer. See MPEP 804 (I) (B)(1), p. 800-17. Applicants submit that no fee is due; however, in the event a fee is required, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 05-0840.

Respectfully submitted,

/Lynn D. Apelgren/
Lynn D. Apelgren
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.45,341
Phone: 317-276-6501

Eli Lilly and Company
Patent Division
P.O. Box 6288
Indianapolis, Indiana 46206-6288

July 8, 2008